

REMARKS

The present amendment and remarks are in response to the Office Action entered in the above identified case and mailed on October 2, 2008. Claims 1-42 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14, 17-31, 33, 34, 36, and 38-42 stand rejected under 35. U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,421,571 to Spriggs et al. (Spriggs). Claims 15, 16, 35, and 37 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-18 applicants respectfully traverse. With respect to the rejection of claims 19-34, Applicants have amended claim 19 to include the features dependent claim 35. Claim 19 is an independent claim that now includes all of the features of objected to, but otherwise allowable claim 35. Accordingly, claim 19 and all of the claims depending therefrom are now in condition for allowance. Similarly, claim 36 has been amended to include the features of objected to but otherwise allowable claim 37. Thus, claim 36 and the claims depending therefrom are all in condition for allowance. Original claims 35 and 37 have been cancelled.

Turning to the rejection of claims 1-18, Applicants note that a claim is anticipated only if each and every limitation of the claim can be found in a single prior art reference. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are allowable over Spriggs because Spriggs does not teach every element of independent claim 1. Claim 1 calls for, among other things, an executable graphic display. The executable graphic display includes one or more visual depictions to be displayed on a display device when the graphic display is executed, a parameter memory adapted to store a value of a parameter, and a binding memory adapted to store a reference for communicatively connecting the parameter memory to a data source within a process plant. At minimum, Spriggs does not disclose an executable graphic display that includes a binding memory adapted to store a reference for communicatively connecting the parameter memory to a data source within a process plant.

The Examiner points to Spriggs col. 6, lines 49-54 as teaching a binding memory storing a reference for communicatively connecting a parameter memory to a data

source. The cited passage, however, merely teaches a utilities module that includes software modules that increase the communications abilities and functionality of the industrial plant asset management system disclosed by Spriggs. According to Spriggs, the utilities include a configuration module, including configuration tools, data exporter modules including custom interface modules, and system extender modules. Nowhere does Spriggs disclose a memory associated with an executable graphic display. More particularly, Spriggs is completely silent regarding a memory associated with an executable graphic display that is adapted to store a reference for communicatively connecting a parameter memory associated with the executable graphic display to a data source within a process plant. Because Spriggs fails to disclose this element of claim 1, claim 1 and all of the claims depending therefrom are not anticipated by Spriggs under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and should be allowed.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims pending in the application are now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the present response he is encouraged to call the Applicant's attorney at the number provided below.

Dated: January 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: Jeffrey H. Canfield #38,404/

Jeffrey H. Canfield

Registration No.: 38,404

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant